

## **REMARKS**

Following entry of the above amendment, claims 4-10, 13-16, 18, and 19 are pending in the above-identified application. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are requested in view of the following remarks.

### *Objections to the Specification*

In response to the objection all embedded hyperlinks have been deleted.

*Claims 4-10, 13-16, 18 and 19 rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Nicholas et al. alone or in view of Davidson et al.*

In the Office Action, claims 4-10, 13-16, 18 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Nicholas et al. alone or in view of Davidson et al.

Applicant respectfully disagrees. Neither Nicholas et al. nor Davidson et al. teach the use of several graphical user interfaces for visualization and no motivation is found for modifying Nicholas et al. or Davidson et al. in the manner claimed.

Nicholas et al. specifically teach away from the claimed invention in describing GeneDoc as a "full featured multiple sequence alignment visualization, editing, mapping and analysis tool." One skilled in the art would not be motivated to modify this "full featured" tool in the manner claimed. Davidson et al. is also does not provide the missing elements or motivation. Davidson et al. is relied on to show that numerous graphical interfaces have been built for various protein database analysis applications. However, there is no teaching or motivation to employ said databases together, let alone in the manner as claimed. That different graphical user interfaces exist does not teach or suggest the use of two graphical interfaces to interact as claimed. For example claim 4 claims "displaying to the user a second multiple sequence alignment representation wherein the sequences that comprise the multiple sequence alignment are shifted such that said selected master sequence alignment domain(s) are aligned with their respective homologous alignment domains that comprise the other said sequences in said multiple sequence alignment." Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the rejection under 103(a) be withdrawn.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. A Notice of Allowance is requested. If the Examiner has any questions or matters that can be expediently handled by telephone, he or she is encouraged to contact the undersigned at (310) 788-9900.

Dated: January 16, 2007

Respectfully submitted,  
Perkins Coie LLP

By: 

Joseph P. Hamilton  
Reg. No. 51,770

**Correspondence Address:**

Customer Number 34055  
Patent – LA  
Perkins Coie LLP  
P.O. Box 1208  
Seattle, WA 98111-1208  
Phone: (310) 788-9900  
Facsimile: (310) 788-3399